IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.12241 of 2006

Dated: June 26, 2006

Between:

St. Damnics Educational Society (Regd.No.368/1979)
rep. by its President, G. Kesava Reddy, S/o. Kista Reddy,
aged about 70 years, R/o. Malakpet, Hyderabad.

… Petitioner

And

The Regional Joint Director of School Education,
Hyderabad, and two others.

… Respondents

Order:

The petitioner, an educational society, filed this writ petition seeking a Writ of Mandamus to declare the action of respondents 1 and 2 in not taking action against the third respondent, a school which is being run without proper permission and recognition.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the third respondent school does not have any permission or recognition as required under the A.P. Education Act, 1982 and the rules framed thereunder. It is stated

that a Division Bench of this Court by order dated 26-04-2006 directed the Director of School Education to get a list of all unrecognized schools published in the newspapers so that the parents can be forewarned of the consequences of their pupils getting admitted in such schools. Pursuant thereto, the second respondent has issued a paper notification dated 26-05-2006, giving the list of unrecognized schools run without permission and recognition, in which the name of the third respondent finds place. It is now alleged that respondents 1 and 2 are not taking any further action against the third respondent.

3. Learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents produced letter No.2046/281/B1/2006 dated 24-06-2006 addressed to him by the District Educational Officer in which the steps taken against the third respondent have been indicated. From a recital of the said letter, it is clear that inspections have been made in the third respondent institution and in spite of warning the authorities of the said institution to close down, the same is not being closed. It is stated that the authorities of the said institution have also been indicated that legal action would be taken against them if the institution is not closed down.

4. In view of the steps that have been taken by the respondents, publishing the notification giving the list of unrecognized schools run without permission and also instructing the authorities of the third respondent to close down their institution, it cannot be said that respondents 1 and 2 are not taking any action against the third respondent. In that view of the matter, no further orders need be passed in this writ petition and it is accordingly closed. However, if the third respondent still continues to run the institution, respondents 1 and 2 shall take steps as per the rules and take appropriate legal

action against the third respondent. No order as to costs.

_____

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

June 26, 2006
N.B. Furnish copy in three days
B/o
MRR